CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DEF				DEFENDANTS				
HARTFORD CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY			RODOLFO CARDE	RODOLFO CARDENAS dba RC DRYWALL				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Hartford (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			NOTE: IN LAN	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.				
Lawrence J. Bistany,	, Address, and Telephone Numl Esq., David E. Edwards, Es 800 One Liberty Place, Phil 864-7166	q.,	Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION	ON (Place an "X" in One Box	Only)			(Place an "X" in One B			
☐ 1. U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government I	Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only) Citizen of This State	PTF DEF		PTF DEF		
☐ 2. U.S. Government Defendant	☑ 4 Diversity	p of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	of Busi	iness In Another State	0 5 0 5		
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	□ 3 □ 3 Foreign	n Nation	□6 □6 ————		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place								
CONTRACT		TS		BANKRUPT 422 Appeal 28 USC		***************************************		
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other		☐ 400 State Reap ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and	portionment Banking		
& Enforcement of Judgment Is 151 Medicare Act Is 2 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Slander Slander Liability 340 Marine	368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT	v	820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark	460 Deportation 470 Racketeer	on Influenced and Organizations		
(Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 345 Marine Product Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal	LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECU	☐ 490 Cable/Sat	TV Commodities/		
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury	Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical	862 Black Lung (923 863 DIWC/DIWW (4 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g))	890 Other Stat 405(g))	utory Actions al Acts ental Matters		
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	****	FEDERAL TAX 870 Taxes (U.S. Plain		•		
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General	☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	y Act/Revie Agency D	ative Procedure w or Appeal of ecision		
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability☐ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 444 Welfare □ 445 Amer, w/Disabilities -	☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 540 Mandamus & Othe ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee- Conditions of Confinement	IMMIGRATION de2 Naturalization Application de3 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee de5 Other Immigration Actions	n	950 Constitution	•		
☑ 1 Original ☐ 2 Re			4 Reinstated or 5 and		Aultidistrict itigation			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdiction statutes unless diversity): 28 U.S.C. §1332(a) Brief description of cause:								
Declaratory Judgment with respect to insurance coverage. VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No								
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBE	R			
DATE M. 22.2m	. ~	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY OF RECORD) [1]				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	()							
RECEIPT#	AMOUNT	APPLYING IFP		N	МАG. ЛИДGE			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: One Hartford Plaza, Hartford, CT 06155						
Address of Defendant: last known: 1138 Pine Street, Easton, PA 18042						
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: The insurance contract was issued to de (Use Reverse Side)	efendant in Easton; the underlying action is pending in Lancaster. de for Additional Space)					
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corpora	tion and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?					
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.	P. 7.1(a)). Yes ⊠ No □					
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes □ No 🏻					
RELATED CASE IF ANY:						
Case Number:						
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions	:					
1. Is this case related to property included in earlier numbered suit pending or w						
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction action in this court?	as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated Yes No No					
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or terminated action in this court?	any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously Yes □ No ☒					
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro	se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes No No					
CIVIL: (Place ☑ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)						
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:					
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	Insurance Contract and Other Contracts					
2. FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury					
3. Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. Assault, Defamation					
4. Antitrust	4. Marine Personal Injury					
5. Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury					
6. Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify)					
7. Civil Rights	 Products Liability Products Liability — Asbestos 					
8. Habeas Corpus	9. All Other Diversity Cases					
9. Security Act(s) Cases	(Please specify)					
 10. ☐ Social Security Review Cases 11. ☐ All other Federal Question Cases (please specify) 						
ARBITRATION CER	TIFICATION					
I, Lawrence J. Bistany , counsel of record do hereby	certify:					
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my k exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	nowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case					
☐ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.						
DATE: May 22 2012	61825 Attorney I.D. #					
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.						
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court						
except as noted above.						
DATE: Mu 22 2012 Attoprey-at-Law	61825 Attorney I.D. #					
CIV. 609 (6/08)	··· •					

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: One Hartford Plaza, Hartford, CT 06155	
Address of Defendant: last known: 1138 Pine Street, Easton, PA 18042	
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: The insurance contract was issue (Use Reve	d to defendant in Easton; the underlying action is pending in Lancaster. erse Side for Additional Space)
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent of	corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.	R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)). Yes ⊠ No □
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes □ No 🏻
RELATED CASE IF ANY:	
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following que	
Is this case related to property included in earlier numbered suit pending	
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction in this court?	saction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated Yes No No
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in s terminated action in this court?	suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously Yes No No
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or	or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes ☐ No ☒
CIVIL: (Place in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury
3. Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. Assault, Defamation
4. Antitrust	4. Marine Personal Injury
5. Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. Civil Rights	7. Products Liability
8. Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
9. Security Act(s) Cases	 All Other Diversity Cases (Please specify)
 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (please specify) 	
	CERTIFICATION
I, Lawrence J. Bistany , counsel of record do h	
☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case
☑ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
DATE: 22 May 12 lunder	61825
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury on	w Attomey I.D. # lly if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case no	w pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court
DATE: 22 May 12 Lon Au	-/ XC 61825
Attorney-at-La CIV. 609 (6/08)	Attomey I.D. #

9191125v.1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

	FORD PANY	CASU	ALTY INSURANCE	: :		
		v.		: :	Civil Action No.	
RODO	OLFO (CARDE	NAS dba RC DRYWALL	: :	110.	
			DISCLOSU	RE STATEMI	ENT FORM	
Please	e check	one box	x:			
	The r	nongove nt corpo	ernmental corporate party, ration and publicly held corp	, in to	he above listed civil action does not have any ons 10% or more of its stock.	
	The nongovernmental corporate party, Hartford Casualty Insurance Company, in the above listed civil action has the following parent corporation(s) and publicly held corporation(s) that ultimately owns 10% or more of its stock:					
	The 1	Hartford	Financial Services Group, I	nc.		
May	.22,20	012_			21,14	
Date ⁰)	,		Signature:	1 2	
				Counsel for:	Hartford Casualty Insurance Company	
Feder	al Rul	e of Civ	il Procedure 7.1 Disclosure	Statement		
	(a) Who Must File; Contents. A nongovernmental corporate party must file two copies of a disclosure statement that:				orporate party must file two	
		(1)	identifies any parent corpo 10% or more of its stock;		publicly held corporation owning	
		(2)	states that there is no such	corporation.		
	(b) Time for Filing; Supplemental Filing. A party must:			ast:		
				ent with its first appearance, pleading, petition, er request addressed to the court, and		
		(2)	promptly file a supplement changes.	tal statement if	any required information	

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Telephone		Fax Number	E-mail Address		
215-	864-6306	(215) 864-7123	bistanyl@whiteandwilliam	s.cc	m
Date		Attorney-at-law	Attorney for Plaintiff		
Mai	r 22 , 2012-	Lawrence J. Bistany			
(f)	f) Standard Management Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.			(.	X)
(e)	(e) Special Management Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)				
(d)	d) Asbestos Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.				
(c)	(c) Arbitration Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.				
(b)	(b) Social Security Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.				
(a)	Habeas Corpus Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. §2241 through §2255.				
SEL!	ECT ONE OF THE FOL	LOWING CASE M	IANAGEMENT TRACKS:		
shall comp form. defen other	complete a Case Manageme laint and serve a copy on all) In the event that a defen dant shall, with its first app	ent Track Designation defendants. (See § 1:0 dant does not agree w earance, submit to the t track designation for	Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plan Form in all civil cases at the time of filing 3 of the plan set forth on the reverse side with the plaintiff regarding said designation clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff arm specifying the track to which that defer	ng t of th n, th and	he nis nat all
	OLFO CARDENAS dba F WALL	C .	: NO. :		
D O D	OLEO CADDENIAS dhe E		: : NO.		
COM	IPANY v.		: :		
	HARTFORD CASUALTY INSURANCE		: CIVIL ACTION		

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

HARTFORD CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY,	: :	
Plaintiff,	:	CIVIL ACTION
v.	:	NO.
RODOLFO CARDENAS doing business as RC DRYWALL,	:	110.
Defendant	:	

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT COMPLAINT

Hartford Casualty Insurance Company ("Hartford") by way of Complaint for declaratory relief alleges as follows:

1. Hartford seeks a declaration that it may withdraw from the defense of Rodolfo Cardenas doing business as RC Drywall and that there is no obligation to indemnify Cardenas and his business in the lawsuit <u>Brian D. Zern, et al.</u> v. <u>Smucker Company, et al.</u>, Civil Action No. 10-15805 (C.P. Lancaster) (the "Underlying Action") because the insured has breached the duty to cooperate condition of the Policy.

THE PARTIES

- 2. Hartford is an Indiana corporation with its principal place of business in Hartford, Connecticut.
- 3. Rodolofo Cardenas obtained an insurance policy from Hartford for himself doing business as R.C. Drywall with a stated address of 1138 Pine Street, Easton, PA within this District and, upon information and belief, is a resident of Pennsylvania.

- 4. Upon information and belief, Rodolfo Cardenas has also been known as Rodolfo C. Cardenas, Rodolfo Velazquez, Rodolfo Cardenas, and Rodolfo Cardenas Velazquez (collectively "Cardenas").
- 5. Upon information and belief, Cardenas left the District after being served with the Underlying Action and had gone to Mexico. Hartford attempted to send correspondence to Cardenas in Mexico but such mail was returned as undeliverable.
- 6. Upon information and belief, Cardenas has returned to Pennsylvania. Upon information and belief, Cardenas recently made inquiries to obtain tax documents and left a local (area code "610") telephone number as his contact information.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has original jurisdiction over this declaratory judgment action based upon 28 U.S.C. §1332(a) and 28 U.S.C. §2201, *et seq*. This action involves a controversy between citizens of different States and the amount in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 8. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(a), venue is proper in this District as a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this claim occurred in this District.
- 9. This court has personal jurisdiction over Cardenas because at the time of the events complained of in the Underlying Action and the filing and service of the Underlying Action, Cardenas was a resident of, and doing business in, Pennsylvania.

THE UNDERLYING ACTION

10. Brian and Lynette Zern sued a number of individuals/entities concerning injuries Brian Zern allegedly suffered on a construction project in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, on March 4, 2010.

- 11. The Zerns allege that Lupe Carbajal ("Carbajal") and Leonardo Garcia ("Garcia") were installing drywall about twenty-eight feet above an archway.
- 12. Carbajal and Garcia dropped a piece which fell on Brian Zern allegedly causing Zern serious injury.
- 13. The Zerns alleged that Carbajal and Garcia either worked for another defendant, Jessup Drywall, or Cardenas.
- 14. Cardenas is alleged to be vicariously liable for the negligence of Carbajal and Garcia.
- 15. A disputed and critical fact in the Underlying Action is who employed Carbajal and Garcia.

THE HARTFORD POLICY

- 16. Hartford issued a multi-part policy to Rodolfo Cardenas dba RC Drywall with policy number 44 SBM EZ0326 with a policy period of 07/23/09 to 07/23/10 (the "Hartford Policy").
- 17. The Hartford Policy provides that the insured must "[c]ooperate with us in the investigation, settlement of the claim or defense against the 'suit' ...".
- 18. Cardenas has failed to cooperate with Hartford in its investigation of and the defense against the Underlying Action.
- 19. Cardenas is not now cooperating with Hartford in its investigation of and the defense against the Underlying Action.

COUNT I (Declaratory Judgment)

20. Hartford incorporates each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs as if each were fully set forth at length herein.

- 21. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2201, et seq., Hartford is entitled to a judicial determination of its rights and obligations under the Hartford Policy with respect to the Underlying Action.
- 22. For the reasons set forth herein, an actual, justifiable controversy exists between the parties concerning their respective rights and obligations under the Hartford Policy with respect to the Underlying Action.
- 23. As an express condition to Hartford's provision of any coverage, defense or indemnity, Cardenas is obligated to cooperate in the defense of the Underlying Action.
- 24. Cardenas has breached his duty to cooperate with Hartford in connection with the investigation and defense of the Underlying Action.
 - 25. Hartford has made repeated efforts to contact Cardenas.
 - 26. Phone calls are not returned by Cardenas.
 - 27. Certified Mail is not signed for and returned as undeliverable.
 - 28. Regular Mail is not responded to by Cardenas.
- 29. Cardenas was aware of the Underlying Action and had been served with process in the Underlying Action.
- 30. Despite having knowledge of the lawsuit and claims against him, Cardenas moved and left no forwarding information. Upon information and belief, Cardenas fled to Mexico.
- 31. Hartford made repeated attempts to contact Cardenas, including in Mexico at what Hartford was informed was Cardenas' address, but all such efforts have been unsuccessful.
- 32. Hartford believes that Cardenas is now back in Pennsylvania and attempts are again being made to reach him but he has again failed to respond to messages.

- 33. A critical issue in the Underlying Action is who employed Carbajal and Garcia.

 Cardenas has necessary and important information on that issue, and other necessary information to the defense of the Underlying Action, but has disappeared.
- 34. Cardenas is subject to default, adverse inferences and/or sanctions by his failure to participate in and cooperate in the defense, materially prejudicing the defense of the Underlying Action.
- 35. Hartford cannot properly provide a defense without information from Cardenas and his business about the claims.
- 36. Cardenas has materially compromised the defense by his failure to cooperate, in breach of his contractual obligations.
- 37. Because Cardenas has materially breached a fundamental condition to the Hartford Policy, there is no coverage for the Underlying Action.
- 38. Hartford should be allowed to withdraw its defense of Cardenas in the Underlying Action.
 - 39. Hartford has no duty to indemnify Cardenas in the Underlying Action.
- 40. Hartford reserves all rights to assert any and all other policy terms, conditions and defenses that may develop.
- 41. An actual, present and *bona fide* controversy exists between the parties concerning their respective rights, duties and obligations.

WHEREFORE, Hartford Casualty Insurance Company demands judgment in its favor and against Rodolfo Cardenas dba RC Drywall declaring:

- (a) The rights, duties, obligations and liabilities, if any, of Hartford and Cardenas with respect to the Hartford Policy in connection with the Underlying Action;
- (b) That Cardenas has breached his duty to cooperate, a condition to coverage under the Hartford Policy;
- (c) That Hartford may withdraw its defense of Cardenas in the Underlying Action;
- (d) That Hartford has no duty to indemnify Cardenas in the Underlying Action;
- (e) And awarding such other and further relief, including costs of suit, as may be just, fitting and proper.

WHITE AND WILLIAMS LLP

By:

Lawrence J. Bistany
David E. Edwards

1650 Market Street

1800 One Liberty Place

Philadelphia, PA 19103

(215)864-6306/7166

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Hartford Casualty Insurance Co.